No. 94-1941 (12)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 16 1995
CLERK

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Petitioner,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, *et al.*,
Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* NATIONAL WOMEN' S LAW CENTER AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER
(Additional *Amici* Listed Inside Cover)

MARCIA D. GREENBERGER
DEBORAH L. BRAKE
JUDITH C. APPLEBAUM
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER
11 Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

SARA L. MANDELBAUM
JANET GALLAGHER
MARY WYCKOFF
STEVEN R. SHAPIRO
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
132 W. 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036

ROBERT N. WEINER
(Counsel of Record)
NANCY L. PERKINS
PETER G. NEIMAN
L. ELIZABETH BOWLES
ROBERTO J. SANCHEZ-RAMOS
ARNOLD & PORTER
555 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 942-5000
Counsel for Amici Curiae

Of Counsel:

SUSAN DELLER ROSS
WENDY W. WILLIAMS
DEBORAH EPSTEIN
SEX DISCRIMINATION CLINIC
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER
Washington, D.C. 20001

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 1-800-347-8208

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

59 pp

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN/USA

CENTER FOR WOMEN POLICY STUDIES

COALITION OF LABOR UNION WOMEN

CONNECTICUT WOMEN' S EDUCATION AND LEGAL FUND

FEMINIST MAJORITY FOUNDATION

FEDERALLY EMPLOYED WOMEN, INC.

MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE
AND EDUCATIONAL FUND

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR GIRLS & WOMEN IN SPORTS

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR WOMEN

NOW LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND

NATIONAL WOMEN' S CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

NATIONAL WOMAN' S PARTY

OLDER WOMEN' S LEAGUE

PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY

TRIAL LAWYERS FOR PUBLIC JUSTICE

WOMEN EMPLOYED

WOMEN' S LAW PROJECT

WOMEN' S LEGAL DEFENSE FUND

WOMEN WORK! THE NATIONAL NETWORK
FOR WOMEN' S EMPLOYMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

INTERESTS OF *AMICI* 1

INTRODUCTION 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 2

ARGUMENT 4

I. ALTHOUGH THE EXCLUSION OF WOMEN FROM VMI FAILS TO WITHSTAND INTERMEDIATE SCRUTINY, THIS COURT SHOULD DECIDE NOW THAT GENDER-BASED CLASSIFICATIONS MUST BE SUBJECT TO STRICT SCRUTINY 4

A. The Intermediate Scrutiny Standard Has Proven To Be Unworkable As Applied to Gender-Based Classifications 6

B. This Court's Recent Decision in Adarand Reinforces the Need To Clarify the Proper Standard of Review for Gender-Based Classifications 12

Pages

II. GOVERNMENTAL CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON GENDER REQUIRE THE APPLICATION OF STRICT SCRUTINY 15

A. All the Reasons Articulated by This Court for Applying Strict Scrutiny Exist with Respect to Gender-Based Classifications 15

1. Sex, Like Race and National Origin, Is an Immutable Characteristic Unrelated to Ability 16

2. There Is a Long History of Sex Discrimination in the United States, and Such Discrimination Continues Today 17

3. Women Are Underrepresented in the Political Process 24

B. Arguments Against the Application of Strict Scrutiny to Gender-Based Discrimination Are Unconvincing 27

CONCLUSION 30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases:

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995) . . . . . passim

Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco, 813 F.2d 922 (9th Cir. 1987) 7,14

Bradwell v. Illinois, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 130 (1873) . 19

Brunet v. City of Columbus, 1 F.3d 390 (6th Cir. 1993), cert. denied, 114 S. Ct. 1190 (1994) 13

City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, 473 U.S. 432 (1985) 15

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson, Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989) . . . . . passim

Cone Corp. v. Hillsborough County, 723 F. Supp. 669 (M.D. Fla. 1989) 13

Conlin v. Blanchard, 890 F.2d 811 (6th Cir. 1989) 13

Page

Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Pa. v. City of Philadelphia, 735 F. Supp. 1274 (E.D. Pa. 1990) 7,11

Coral Constr. Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910 (9th Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1033 (1992) 6

Country v. Parratt, 684 F.2d 588 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1043 (1982) 10

Eberhart v. State, 727 P.2d 1374 (Okla. Crim. App. 1986) 10

Estate of Baer, 562 P.2d 614 (Utah), appeal dismissed, 434 U.S. 805 (1977) 10

Faulkner v. Jones, 51 F.3d 440 (4th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, __ S. Ct. __ 1995 WL 500529 (Oct. 10, 1995) 8

Foley v. Connelie, 435 U.S. 291 (1978) 24

Frontiero v. Richardson, 411 U.S. 677 (1973) . . . . . passim

Page

Goesaert v. Cleary, 335 U.S. 464 (1948) 20

Graham v. Richardson, 403 U.S. 365 (1971) 29

Harris v. Forklift Sys., 114 S. Ct. 367 (1993) 5

Hess v. Wims, 613 S.W.2d 85 (Ark. 1981) 10

Hines v. Caston School Corp., 651 N.E.2d 330 (Ind. Ct. App. 1995) 11

Hoyt v. Florida, 368 U.S. 57 (1961) 20

Huskins v. State, 266 S.E.2d 163 (Ga. 1980) 11

Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213 (1983) 5

In re Estate of Reed, 354 So. 2d 864 (Fla. 1978) 10

J.E.B. v. Alabama, 114 S. Ct. 1419 (1994) . . . . passim

Joseph v. City of Birmingham, 510 F. Supp. 1319 (E.D. Mich. 1981) 7

Page

Kirstein v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Va., 309 F. Supp. 184 (E.D. Va. 1970) 20

Kleczek v. Rhode Island Interscholastic League, Inc., 612 A.2d 734 (R.I. 1992) 11

Lamprecht v. FCC, 958 F.2d 382 (D.C. Cir. 1992) 6

Lloyd v. State Div. of Parole and Probation, 557 F. Supp. 1297 (D. Md. 1983) 11

Lyng v. Castillo, 477 U.S. 635 (1986) 15

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803) . . 5

Massachusetts Bd. of Retirement v. Murgia, 427 U.S. 307 (1976) 15,18

Meloon v. Helgemoe, 564 F.2d 602 (1st Cir. 1977), cert. denied, 436 U.S. 950 (1978) 7

Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 162 (1875) 19

Page

Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718 (1982) . . . . . passim

Moore v. Cowan, 560 F.2d 1298 (6th Cir. 1977), cert. denied, 435 U.S. 929 (1978) 10

Newberg v. School Dist. of Pa., slip op. at 46 (Pa. Ct. of C.P., Philadelphia County, Aug. 30, 1983) aff'd, 478 A.2d 1352 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1984) 9

Olesen v. Board of Educ. of Sch. Dist. No. 228, 676 F. Supp. 820 (N.D. Ill. 1987) 11

Orr v. Orr, 440 U.S. 268 (1979) 17

People v. Lewis, 309 N.W.2d 234 (Mich. Ct. App. 1981) 11

People v. Liberta, 474 N.E.2d 567 (N.Y. 1984), cert. denied, 471 U.S. 1020 (1985) 10

Perini v. State, 264 S.E.2d 172 (Ga. 1980) 11

Page

Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202 (1982) 15,18

Rodriguez v. Harris, 496 F. Supp. 116 (S.D.N.Y. 1980) 10

Stanton v. Stanton, 421 U.S. 7 (1975) 5,16

State v. Culver, 233 Neb. 228, 444 N.W.2d 662 (1989) 9

State v. Fuller, 377 So. 2d 335 (La. 1979) 11

State v. Gurganus, 250 S.E.2d 668 (N.C. Ct. App. 1979) 10

State v. Ware, 418 A.2d 1 (R.I. 1980) 10

Tatro v. State, 372 So. 2d 283 (Miss. 1979) 10

Taylor v. Louisiana, 419 U.S. 522 (1975) 20

Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288 (1989) 15

United States v. Broussard, 987 F.2d 215 (5th Cir. 1993) 9

Page

United States v. Nichols, 937 F.2d 1257 (7th Cir. 1991) 9

Vorchheimer v. School Dist. of Philadelphia, 532 F.2d 880 (3d Cir. 1976), aff'd without op., 430 U.S. 703 (1977) 9

Statutes:

Equal Pay Act of 1963, 29 U.S.C. § 206(d) (1988) . . 18

Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (§ 504), 29 U.S.C. § 794 (1988) 26

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (1988) 18,26

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 (1994) 18,26,27

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d (1988) 26

42 U.S.C. §§ 2000a (1988) and 12182 (Supp. V 1993) 27

Page

42 U.S.C. § 1981 (1988) 27

18 U.S.C. § 245(b)(2) (1994) 27

28 U.S.C. § 534 Note (Supp. II 1990) 27

Constitution:

Equal Protection Clause 2

Miscellaneous:

Babcock, et al., Sex Discrimination and the Law: Causes and Remedies (1975) 18,19,20

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dep't of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States 396 (1994) 21,22

Maureen B. Cavanaugh, Towards a New Equal Protection: Two Kinds of Equality, 12 Law & Ineq. J. 381 (1994) 7

Page

Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women Candidates and Winners in 1992 (1992) (fact sheet) 25

Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Elective Office 1995 (1995) (fact sheet) 25,26

Kimberle Crenshaw, Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics, 1989 U. Chi. Legal F. 139 29

Curran and Carson, American Bar Foundation, The Lawyer Statistical Report 10 (1994) 22

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry 1 (1994) 21

Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, Good for Business: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital 12 (1995) 22,23

Page

Jennifer Friesen, State Constitutional Law: Litigating Individual Rights Claims and Defenses ¶ 3.02(c)(i) (1994) 30

Henry Louis Gates, Blacklash?, The New Yorker, May 17, 1993, at 42 29

Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Women as Full Members of the Club: An Evolving American Ideal, 6 Hum. Rts. 1 (1976-77) 24

E.A. Hull, Sex Discrimination and the Equal Protection Clause: An Analysis of Kahn v. Shevin and Orr v. Orr, 30 Syracuse L. Rev. 639 (1979) 7

Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy 1073 (Appendix 5) (1944) 19

National Committee on Pay Equity, The Wage Gap: 1993 22

9 to 5, Profile of Working Women 1 (1992-93) 21

Page

Note, Equal Protection and the "Middle-Tier": The Impact on Women and Illegitimates, 54 Notre Dame L. Rev. 303 (1978) 8

3 Ronald D. Rotunda & John E. Nowak, Treatise on Constitutional Law: Substance and Procedure § 18.23 (2d ed. 1992) . . 7

United Nations, The World's Women: 1995 Trends and Statistics 152 (1995) 25

Patricia Williams, The Alchemy of Race and Rights (1991) 29

Wendy Williams, The Equality Crisis: Some Reflections on Culture, Courts and Feminism, 7 Women's Rts. L. Rep. 175 (1982) 24

Women's Bureau, U.S. Dep't of Labor, Women Workers: Trends and Issues 35 (1993) 23

Robert G. Wood et al., Pay Differences Among the Highly Paid: The Male-Female Earnings Gap in Lawyers' Salaries, 11 J. Lab. Econ. 417 (July 1993) 23

INTERESTS OF *AMICI*

Amici curiae are organizations strongly committed to achieving equity for women and have a demonstrated interest in assuring the sound interpretation of the protections guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Descriptions of the individual organizations are set forth in the attached appendix.[1]

INTRODUCTION

Virginia for 150 years has offered men a benefit it denies women -- the opportunity to pursue an education at VMI. Virginia began excluding women from VMI when it founded the college in 1839 -- a time when Virginia considered African-American slaves to be property and subjected married women to the total control of their husbands. Despite vast changes in the status of women, Virginia's exclusion of women from VMI has "unquestionably been driven unchanged since its origins by a stereotyped view of the proper role and capabilities of women in society." A. 44a-45a (Phillips, J., dissenting). Virginia's creation of a gender-stereotyped, separate and inferior program for women -- the Virginia Women's Institute for Leadership ("VWIL") at Mary Baldwin College -- cannot begin to remedy the constitutional

---

[1] The parties' written consent to the filing of this brief has been filed with the Court.

deprivations of rights caused by the exclusion of women from VMI.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This Court has left open the question whether governmental classifications based on sex warrant strict scrutiny under the Equal Protection Clause. The time has come to decide that strict scrutiny applies.

The standard of intermediate scrutiny for gender classifications has proved an unworkable half-measure. To be sure, Virginia's separate but unequal educational program for women falls far short of satisfying the test of intermediate scrutiny. Nevertheless, the courts below found intermediate scrutiny sufficiently malleable to uphold Virginia's discrimination against women based on regressive gender stereotypes. Despite this Court's repeated efforts to strengthen the standard of intermediate scrutiny, the standard has yielded incorrect and inconsistent results in the lower courts, and generated frequent complaints about the lack of guidance it affords.

In addition, after Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995) and City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989) (plurality opinion), continued application of intermediate scrutiny creates a serious anomaly in equal protection jurisprudence. White men receive greater constitutional protection from race-conscious affirmative action plans, however benignly

intended, than women receive from sex discrimination. And, in the policy arena, distinctions between the standard of review for race and gender-based classifications often blur, causing women to be more easily discriminated against than to benefit from programs designed to overcome such discrimination. The need to clarify and harmonize the Court's prior decisions provides good cause to rule now that strict scrutiny is the proper standard of review for classifications based on gender.

The Court has identified several warning signs that indicate that a particular classification is suspect and therefore warrants strict scrutiny. One factor supporting the application of strict scrutiny to gender-based classifications is that gender is an immutable characteristic unrelated to ability, and therefore such classifications are likely to reflect harmful stereotypes that continue to disadvantage women. Second, strict scrutiny is appropriate because women have suffered from a long -- and continuing -- history of discrimination. Third, women remain severely underrepresented in the political process, and lack the power necessary to prevent sex-based discrimination like that at issue here.

The fact that women constitute a numerical majority in this country is no argument against strict scrutiny. As the historical record reflects, the percentage of women in the population has never prevented discrimination against them. Moreover, under Adarand and Croson, strict scrutiny applies to race-based classifications that purportedly discriminate

against whites, a majority group. Further, under Adarand, strict scrutiny is not fatal in fact for such classifications, nor should it be for sex-based classifications designed to remedy discrimination against women.

In short, the Court should direct now, once and for all, that courts strictly scrutinize governmental classifications based on gender.

ARGUMENT

I. ALTHOUGH THE EXCLUSION OF WOMEN FROM VMI FAILS TO WITHSTAND INTERMEDIATE SCRUTINY, THIS COURT SHOULD DECIDE NOW THAT GENDER-BASED CLASSIFICATIONS MUST BE SUBJECT TO STRICT SCRUTINY

The brief for the United States sets forth persuasively why the separate but unequal program at VWIL cannot withstand the intermediate scrutiny this Court has applied in cases such as J.E.B. v. Alabama, 114 S. Ct. 1419 (1994), and Mississippi Univ. for Women v. Hogan, 458 U.S. 718 (1982).[2] Amici agree with the government's arguments and do not reiterate them here. Rather, amici urge that the Court take this opportunity in this case to hold that sex is a suspect class under the Equal Protection Clause -- a question

[2] Because the exclusion of women from VMI cannot withstand intermediate scrutiny, it necessarily cannot survive strict scrutiny.

this Court has repeatedly left open. See J.E.B., 114 S. Ct. at 1426 n.6.; Hogan, 458 U.S. at 724 n.9; Harris v. Forklift Sys., 114 S. Ct. 367, 373 (1993) (Ginsburg, J., concurring); Stanton v. Stanton, 421 U.S. 7, 13 (1975). The Court should hold now that governmental classifications based on gender must withstand strict scrutiny.

That intermediate scrutiny yields the right result in this case is not a good reason to continue to apply it. To the contrary, there are compelling reasons why the Court should now announce that strict scrutiny applies. In particular, there is a need to eliminate confusion in the lower courts, and to resolve serious inconsistencies in the law resulting from this Court's decisions in Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena, 115 S. Ct. 2097 (1995) and City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989) (plurality opinion).

When presented with such good cause to decide a constitutional issue, this Court has not stayed its hand. See, e.g., Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288, 300 (1989) (reaching issue of retroactivity because of need "to clarify the question"). See also Illinois v. Gates, 462 U.S. 213, 230 (1983) (replacing the two-pronged, probable-cause test with the totality-of-the-circumstances test although the same result would obtain); Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803) (holding that the Supreme Court could issue mandamus although such determination was unnecessary).

A. The Intermediate Scrutiny Standard Has Proven To Be Unworkable As Applied to Gender-Based Classifications

There is serious confusion among the lower courts regarding the application of intermediate scrutiny to governmental classifications based on sex. The standard requires a court to determine whether the government can offer an "exceedingly persuasive justification" for a gender classification and to evaluate whether the classification serves "'important governmental objectives and [whether] the discriminatory means employed' are 'substantially related to the achievement of those objectives.'" Hogan, 458 U.S. at 724 (quoting Wengler v. Druggists Mut. Ins. Cos., 466 U.S. 142, 150 (1980)).

Despite decisions of this Court strengthening the intermediate scrutiny standard, lower courts have had great difficulty assessing the importance of governmental interests and in calibrating whether the fit between the classification and the government's purpose is "substantially related."[3] The lower courts have complained repeatedly that the standard provides little guidance for decisionmaking. See, e.g., Lamprecht v. FCC, 958 F.2d 382, 398 n.9 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (referring to intermediate scrutiny as indeterminate); Coral Constr. Co. v. King County, 941 F.2d 910, 931 (9th Cir. 1991) ("[w]e are cognizant of the problems with intermediate scrutiny"), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1033 (1992); Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco, 813 F.2d 922, 939 (9th Cir. 1987) ("[intermediate scrutiny] provides 'relatively little guidance in individual cases'") (citation omitted); Meloon v. Helgemoe, 564 F.2d 602, 604 (1st Cir. 1977) (calling intermediate scrutiny "hardly a precise standard"), cert. denied, 436 U.S. 950 (1978); Contractors Ass'n of E. Pa. v. City of Philadelphia, 735 F. Supp. 1274, 1303 (E.D. Pa. 1990) (asserting that intermediate scrutiny provides little guidance to courts in decision making); Joseph v. City of Birmingham, 510 F. Supp. 1319, 1335 n.22 (E.D. Mich. 1981) ("[intermediate scrutiny does] not provide definite guidance . . . decisions may appear inconsistent and unprincipled"). Commentators echo the courts' complaints.[4]

---

[3] Cf. J.E.B. v. Alabama, 114 S. Ct. at 1433 (Kennedy, J., concurring) ("the intermediate scrutiny test" does not "provide a very clear standard in all instances").

[4] See, e.g., Maureen B. Cavanaugh, Towards a New Equal Protection: Two Kinds of Equality, 12 Law & Ineq. J. 381, 382 (1994) (criticizing "the Court's ad hoc, and hence variable, analysis as applied to equal protection challenges to gender-based discrimination"); 3 Ronald D. Rotunda & John E. Nowak, Treatise on Constitutional Law § 18.23, at 277 (2d ed. 1992) ("The Court's decisions appear to be ad hoc judgments based upon Justices' perceptions of the gender classification at issue in each case."); E.A. Hull, Sex Discrimination and the Equal Protection Clause: An Analysis of Kahn v. Shevin and Orr v. Orr, 30 Syracuse L. Rev. 639, 671 (1979) ("the middle tier has no predictable application. Whether or not a given classification furthers an 'important governmental interest,' or is 'substantially related' to this interest, are subjective determinations, and a conservative majority is as likely to conclude one way as a liberal majority is to conclude the

In practice, the intermediate scrutiny standard has produced erroneous, confused, and inconsistent results in the lower courts. The decision below -- which relies on a wholly new construction of intermediate scrutiny to embrace gender-based stereotypes and uphold the denial of equal opportunity to women -- exemplifies such confusion. The court of appeals misapplied intermediate scrutiny to sustain all but "pernicious" governmental classifications based on gender, essentially transforming the standard into the minimal rational basis test. A. 22a. Strict scrutiny is not so easily susceptible to misunderstanding. See Rotunda and Nowak, supra note 4, § 18.23, at 286-87 (strict scrutiny "would limit the ability of individual judges to argue for the legitimacy of gender classifications based upon their personal perceptions of the reasonableness of allocating rights by gender").

Other lower court opinions also demonstrate how the intermediate standard of review has been manipulated. For example, Faulkner v. Jones, 51 F.3d 440 (4th Cir. 1995), cert. denied, __ S. Ct. __, 1995 WL 500529 (Oct. 10, 1995), left open the possibility that South Carolina may be permitted to deny women a Citadel education by operating an alternative, inferior leadership training program for women. See id. at 450 (Hall, J., concurring) ("I am convinced that we have embarked on a path that will

---

other"); Note, Equal Protection and the "Middle-Tier": The Impact on Women and Illegitimates, 54 Notre Dame L. Rev. 303, 321 (1978) (noting the highly subjective nature of the inquiry and the "confusion and inconsistency generated" by the intermediate scrutiny standard).

inevitably fall short of providing women their deserved equal access to important avenues of power and responsibility.").

In other cases, lower courts have reached clearly incorrect results applying intermediate scrutiny. For example, before this Court decided J.E.B., numerous courts upheld gender-based peremptory strikes based on traditional and overbroad stereotypes. See United States v. Nichols, 937 F.2d 1257, 1262-64 (7th Cir. 1991); United States v. Broussard, 987 F.2d 215, 218-20 (5th Cir. 1993); State v. Culver, 444 N.W.2d 662 (Neb. 1989). See also Vorchheimer v. School Dist. of Philadelphia, 532 F.2d 880 (3d Cir. 1976) (holding that the exclusion of girls from an all-male high school would survive both rational basis and substantial relationship reviews despite the fact that the all-male school had a superior science program), aff'd without op., 430 U.S. 703 (1977) (equally divided Court).[5]

The intermediate scrutiny standard has also produced conflicting results in similar cases. Lower courts have applied intermediate scrutiny to reach different results regarding:

- the constitutionality of rape statutes punishing only male rapists who attack female victims, compare

---

[5] Notably, a Pennsylvania court reached an opposite conclusion in a later challenge to the same school system under both the Equal Protection Clause and the state equal rights amendment. Newberg v. School Dist. of Pa., slip op. at 46 (Pa. Ct. of C.P., Philadelphia County, Aug. 30, 1983), aff'd, 478 A.2d 1352 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1984).

Country v. Parratt, 684 F.2d 588 (8th Cir.) (upholding statute), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 1043 (1982), Moore v. Cowan, 560 F.2d 1298 (6th Cir. 1977) (same), cert. denied, 435 U.S. 929 (1978), Rodriguez v. Harris, 496 F. Supp. 116 (S.D.N.Y. 1980) (same), and Eberhart v. State, 727 P.2d 1374 (Okla. Crim. App. 1986) (same), with People v. Liberta, 474 N.E.2d 567 (N.Y. 1984) (striking down statute), cert. denied, 471 U.S. 1020 (1985);

- the constitutionality of criminal statutes distinguishing between male and female defendants who commit the same crime, compare State v. Gurganus, 250 S.E.2d 668 (N.C. Ct. App. 1979) (upholding assault statute penalizing males more heavily than females when the victim is a female) and State v. Ware, 418 A.2d 1 (R.I. 1980) (same) with Tatro v. State, 372 So. 2d 283 (Miss. 1979) (striking down statute prohibiting males but not females from sexually assaulting a child less than fourteen years old);

- the constitutionality of statutes permitting a widow, but not a widower, to elect against a spouse's will, compare Estate of Baer, 562 P.2d 614 (Utah) (upholding statute), appeal dismissed, 434 U.S. 805 (1977) with Hess v. Wims, 613 S.W.2d 85 (Ark. 1981) (striking down statute) and In re Estate of Reed, 354 So. 2d 864 (Fla. 1978) (same); and

- the constitutionality of criminal statutes imposing different penalties on men and women for nonsupport of spouses and children, compare Perini v. State, 264 S.E.2d 172 (Ga. 1980) (upholding statute) and Huskins v. State, 266 S.E.2d 163 (Ga. 1980) (same) with State v. Fuller, 377 So. 2d 335 (La. 1979) (striking down statute), Lloyd v. State Div. of Parole and Probation, 557 F. Supp. 1297 (D. Md. 1983) (same), and People v. Lewis, 309 N.W.2d 234 (Mich. Ct. App. 1981) (same).

Even on a question that this Court has clearly answered -- who carries the burden of proof to demonstrate the "importance" of the government's interest and whether that interest is "substantially related" to the classification at issue, see Hogan, 458 U.S. at 724 -- the lower courts have failed to agree. Compare Hines v. Caston School Corp., 651 N.E.2d 330, 335 (Ind. Ct. App. 1995) (burden is on the challenger) (citations omitted) and Olesen v. Board of Educ. of Sch. Dist. No. 228, 676 F. Supp. 820, 823 (N.D. Ill. 1987) (same) with Kleczek v. Rhode Island Interscholastic League, Inc., 612 A.2d 734, 737 (R.I. 1992) (burden is on the state) and Contractors Ass'n of Eastern Pa., 735 F. Supp. at 1300 (same).

B. This Court's Recent Decision in Adarand Reinforces the Need To Clarify the Proper Standard of Review for Gender-Based Classifications

Clarification of the proper standard of review for gender-based classifications is also necessary to ensure consistency in this Court's jurisprudence. The Court's recent decision in Adarand, coupled with its earlier decision in Croson, has created an anomaly in equal protection law. For this reason as well, classifications based on gender should be subject to strict scrutiny.[6]

Under Adarand and Croson, race-based classifications, including certain programs intended to remedy race discrimination against minorities, are subject to strict scrutiny. If gender-based classifications continue to be evaluated under intermediate scrutiny, white males will have greater constitutional protection from race-conscious affirmative action, however benignly intended, than women will have from invidious sex discrimination.[7] As a matter

---

[6] Amici believe that racial and sex-based classifications intended to remedy discrimination should be subject to review under a standard less stringent than strict scrutiny. However, particularly since the Court has held that strict scrutiny applies to all race-based classifications regardless of intention, amici urge that sex-based classifications that discriminate against women be accorded the same treatment.

[7] Cf. Adarand, 115 S. Ct. at 2122 (Stevens, J., dissenting) (noting the "anomalous result" created by the application of strict scrutiny to affirmative action programs designed to remedy invidious race

of logic and history, this result cannot be squared with a principled equal protection analysis.

Moreover, as a matter not of law, but of practical reality, unless the Court applies a standard of strict scrutiny to classifications based on gender, it will be easier for the government to discriminate against women than to remedy discrimination against them. Many affirmative action programs, as in Adarand, are designed to remedy discrimination against both minorities and women.[8] Although not required by this Court's precedents, public policy makers are likely to continue to treat women and minorities similarly under these programs, thereby applying the standard of strict scrutiny to affirmative action programs benefiting women that they now must apply to affirmative action programs benefiting minorities.[9]

---

discrimination yet intermediate scrutiny to affirmative programs designed to remedy sex discrimination).

[8] One of the federal programs discussed in Adarand presumed that women as well as members of minority groups were "socially and economically disadvantaged individuals," and created incentives to encourage the awarding of federal contracts to such individuals. Adarand, 115 S. Ct. at 2102.

[9] Indeed, although nothing in Adarand or in Croson supports such application, some courts have already improperly applied strict scrutiny to gender-based affirmative action programs. See Brunet v. City of Columbus, 1 F.3d 390 (6th Cir. 1993), cert. denied, 114 S. Ct. 1190 (1994); Conlin v. Blanchard, 890 F.2d 811 (6th Cir. 1989); Cone Corp. v. Hillsborough County, 723 F. Supp. 669 (M.D. Fla. 1989). But

Consequently, unless gender-based discrimination is subjected to strict scrutiny, the government will in practice exercise greater leeway to create and implement programs or policies that discriminate against women than programs or policies designed to overcome such discrimination. Such an anomaly represents a serious miscarriage of justice and has no place in equal protection jurisprudence. This Court in Adarand insisted that consistency was an important principle in equal protection law. See Adarand, 115 S. Ct. at 2112-13. The Court should act to salvage that principle now.

In sum, the Court should not require litigants who have been subjected to discrimination to proceed under intermediate scrutiny. It should not require the lower courts to struggle with an unworkable standard. And it should not let the anomaly created by Adarand become any more entrenched. Instead, the Court should declare without further delay that gender classifications must be subject to strict scrutiny.

---

see Associated Gen. Contractors, 813 F.2d at 941 (applying intermediate scrutiny to gender-based affirmative action plan).

II. GOVERNMENTAL CLASSIFICATIONS BASED ON GENDER REQUIRE THE APPLICATION OF STRICT SCRUTINY

A. All the Reasons Articulated by This Court for Applying Strict Scrutiny Exist with Respect to Gender-Based Classifications

This Court has identified a number of warning signals that indicate that a classification is suspect and therefore warrants strict scrutiny. Although these signals are not prerequisites to declaring a class to be suspect, they raise concern whether governmental processes have been infected by prejudice or stereotypes. Thus, the Court has considered whether a classification rests on immutable characteristics unrelated to ability, Frontiero v. Richardson, 411 U.S. 677, 686 (1973) (plurality opinion); Lyng v. Castillo, 477 U.S. 635, 638 (1986); City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, 473 U.S. 432, 440-41 (1985), whether there is a history of "purposeful unequal treatment" against the affected class, Massachusetts Bd. of Retirement v. Murgia, 427 U.S. 307, 313 (1976), and whether the targeted class has been underrepresented in the political process, Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 686. See also Plyler v. Doe, 457 U.S. 202, 216-17 n.14 (1982).

In Frontiero, a plurality of this Court, focusing on these warning signals, concluded that "classifications based upon sex, like classifications based upon race, alienage, and national origin, are inherently suspect, and must therefore be

subjected to close judicial scrutiny." Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 688. As shown below, the factors that persuaded the plurality in Frontiero to recognize sex as a suspect class have equal force today.

1. Sex, Like Race and National Origin, Is an Immutable Characteristic Unrelated to Ability

In Frontiero, the plurality emphasized the immutability of gender and its lack of connection with individual ability. See Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 686. When a characteristic, such as gender, does not determine the ability of an individual "to perform or contribute to society," id., classifications based on that characteristic are unlikely to further a legitimate state interest. Rather, as this case demonstrates, the classification may well reflect stereotypes, with the effect of excluding women from power in a particular domain. This Court has repeatedly recognized that danger with regard to gender. See, e.g., J.E.B., 114 S. Ct. at 1422 (sex-based classifications may not "serv[e] to ratify and perpetuate invidious, archaic, and overbroad stereotypes about the relative abilities of men and women").

Governmental classifications based on gender stereotypes stigmatize and harm women, inflicting injuries that extend beyond those persons immediately affected by the government's action. Stanton v. Stanton, 421 U.S. 7, 14-15 (1975) (striking down state statute that relied on "old notions" to require child support for males up to age 21 and

females up to age 18, which effectively denied females a college education); Orr v. Orr, 440 U.S. 268, 283 (1979) (striking down legislative classification that risked "reinforcing the stereotypes about the 'proper place' of women" and denied aid to needy men); see also Hogan, 458 U.S. at 725, 730 n.15 (stating that "[c]are must be taken in ascertaining whether the statutory objective itself reflects archaic and stereotypic notions," and noting that, although purportedly based on a protective rationale, "excluding men from the field [of nursing] has depressed nurses' wages").

The facts and history of this case underscore that governments continue to use stereotyped gender classifications that block women's participation in powerful societal institutions. The decisions below, and the actions of Virginia that they validate, rely on numerous stereotypes to exclude women from a prestigious educational institution. In the telling phrase of the district court, Virginia -- legitimately in the court's view -- sought to teach men to march "to the beat of a drum" and women "to the melody of a fife." A. 84a. This should indeed raise a red flag that there is a need for a more clear-cut and exacting standard of review of governmental classifications based on gender.

2. There Is a Long History of Sex Discrimination in the United States, and Such Discrimination Continues Today

A second warning signal this Court looks to in determining whether to apply strict scrutiny is a history of

discrimination against the group at issue. See Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 684-85; Murgia, 427 U.S. at 313. Such a history signals that governmental decision making may be tainted by stereotypes and prejudice, resulting in invidious discrimination and exclusion. Plyler, 457 U.S. at 216-17 n.14.

As the plurality recognized in Frontiero, "[t]here can be no doubt that our Nation has a long and unfortunate history of sex discrimination." 411 U.S. at 684. From its beginning, the United States maintained a dual system of law for men and women -- separate and unequal. The Constitution effectively excluded women from the vote and from service in the national legislature by permitting state law -- which explicitly reserved the vote and service in the state legislature to men -- to control federal elections and service in Congress.[10]

The federal and state legislatures provided women no remedy for their exclusion from colleges, from the professions, from the best jobs, and from equal pay.[11] State law made the husband the legal "head" of each family -

[10] Barbara Allen Babcock et al., Sex Discrimination and the Law: Causes and Remedies 69-70 (1975).

[11] Not until the 1960s did the nation begin to take action on the job front, through the Equal Pay Act of 1963, 29 U.S.C. § 206(d)(1988), and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (1988), and not until the 1970s did it take action on the education front, through Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 (1994).

- a choice left to the states' sole discretion by the Constitution.[12] Even after the convulsive changes wrought by the Civil War and the Fourteenth Amendment, the judiciary held that women had neither the right to vote, Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 162, 177-78 (1875), nor the right to practice law, see Bradwell v. Illinois, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 130, 139 (1873). Indeed, as this Court recently observed in the jury context, the position of women throughout much of the 19th century "was, in many respects, comparable to that of blacks under the pre-Civil War slave codes." J.E.B., 114 S. Ct. at 1425 (quoting Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 685). See also Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and American Democracy 1073 (Appendix 5) (1944) (recognizing that the legal status of women and children served as a model for the legal status of slaves). It was not until 1920 that women finally gained the right to vote.

As women moved into the new industrial workforce in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, states enacted laws explicitly requiring both private and public employers to discriminate against women at work. Such laws required,

[12] As head of the family the husband voted for the wife, owned her personal property, managed and controlled all of her real property, owned her labor, and was entitled to custody and control of her children. The husband also chose his wife's domicile and was responsible for her debts. The husband was specifically immunized from any legal consequences for raping his wife and was effectively immunized for beating her by the law's reluctance to intervene unless she suffered serious and permanent injury. Babcock et al., supra note 10, at 561-63. See also id. at 1-2 (describing the dual law system for men and women).

for example, employers to exclude women from certain occupations, from more lucrative overtime work, heavy work, night work, and from working before or after childbirth. Babcock et al., supra note 10, at 261. Even as late as 1948, this Court upheld a statute prohibiting women from being bartenders because of the "moral and social problems" that arise when women -- but apparently not men -- tend bar. Goesaert v. Cleary, 335 U.S. 464, 466 (1948).[13]

Such stereotyping has continued to exclude women from spheres of power throughout the 20th century. As late as 1961, the Court justified an exemption from jury service for women on the ground that "woman is still regarded as the center of home and family life" unless "she herself determines that such service is consistent with her own special responsibilities." Hoyt v. Florida, 368 U.S. 57, 62 (1961). It was not until 1975 that the Court finally struck down an exemption from jury service for women. See Taylor v. Louisiana, 419 U.S. 522, 537 (1975). And, of particular relevance here, not until 1970 was the University of Virginia ordered to admit women. See Kirstein v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Va., 309 F. Supp. 184, 187 (E.D. Va. 1970).

---

[13] Compare Goesaert, 335 U.S. at 467 (rejecting argument that legislature's exclusion of women, except wives or daughters of male owners, from bartending "was an unchivalrous desire of male bartenders to try to monopolize the calling") with Babcock, supra note 10, at 280-81 (recounting vigorous campaign waged by bartender's union after World War II to restore bartending to an exclusively male job).

Despite the advances of women in society, and despite the application of intermediate scrutiny to sex-based classifications nearly 20 years ago, the stereotypes reflected in the historical record persist. This Court's recognition in Frontiero, over two decades ago, that "women still face pervasive, though at times more subtle, discrimination," 411 U.S. at 686, remains true today.

Although women now compose nearly half the U.S. workforce,[14] they are still relegated to jobs that generally pay less and provide fewer benefits than traditionally "male" jobs. For example, women occupy predominantly administrative support jobs: in 1991, one out of every four working women held such a job, and women constituted 82 percent of the total administrative support workforce in all industries.[15] Women are also underrepresented in many professional and technical jobs, comprising only 8.6 percent of all engineers, 3.9 percent of airplane pilots and navigators, 18.6 percent of architects, and little more than 20 percent of doctors and lawyers.[16] While

---

[14] Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dep't of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States 396 (1994).

[15] 9 to 5, Profile of Working Women 1 (1992-93) (based on U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of Census data) (on file with National Women's Law Center); Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry 1993 1 (1994) (table 1).

[16] Bureau of the Census, supra note 14, at 407-09 (citing 1994 census data).

89.5 percent of all dentists are male, 99.3 percent of all dental hygienists are female.[17]

Even where women have begun to overcome traditional barriers to entry, they remain disproportionately in the lower ranks of workplace hierarchies. For example, women are now 23 percent of attorneys, but only 10 percent of law firm partners.[18] The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission recently found that, in 1994, only two of the Fortune 1000 companies had female Chief Executive Officers, and, of the Fortune 1500 companies' senior managerial positions, only three to five percent were held by women.[19]

Women also continue to earn less than their male counterparts in comparable jobs. In 1994, women earned an average of 72 cents for every dollar earned by men.[20] A wage disparity between men and women exists even where their educational levels are the same, and in fact increases as men's and women's levels of education increase. In a 1989 study, women who had completed four years of college

---

17 Id.

18 Id. at 407; Curran and Carson, American Bar Foundation, The Lawyer Statistical Report 10 (1994).

19 Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, Good for Business: Making Full Use of the Nation's Human Capital 12 (1995).

20 National Committee on Pay Equity, The Wage Gap: 1993 (citing U.S. Dep't of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60).

earned $26,709, while their male counterparts earned $38,565.[21] Even when women have more education than men, they generally earn less. In 1979 and 1989, women with a high school diploma earned less than or as much as men with only an elementary school education. Similarly, women with some college education earned less than men with a high school degree.[22]

The stubborn persistence of these disparities demonstrates that women remain a disadvantaged group and that gender-based stereotypes continue to infect society at large. Indeed, the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission cited stereotyping as one of the major barriers to advancement of women in the workplace.[23]

In sum, there is a longstanding and continuing history of discrimination against women -- discrimination that, as this Court has recognized, can too easily infect the processes of governmental decision making. Just as the remnants of the law of slavery and the post- Civil War Black Codes -- that

---

21 Women's Bureau, U.S. Dep't of Labor, Women Workers: Trends and Issues 35, 97 (1993). These disparities exist even after controlling for work experience, hours of work, family responsibilities, and other variables. See Robert G. Wood et al., Pay Differences Among the Highly Paid: The Male-Female Earnings Gap in Lawyers' Salaries, 11 J. Lab. Econ. 417, 430-31 (July 1993).

22 Women's Bureau, supra note 21, at 97.

23 Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, supra note 19, at 28.

dual structure of laws governing whites and blacks -- are suspect, so should the vestiges of that preexisting legal system that confined and disadvantaged women be equally suspect.[24]

3. Women Are Underrepresented in the Political Process

Because the Court has applied strict scrutiny to ensure that prejudice and stereotypes have not tainted the political process to the disadvantage of particular groups, it has viewed underrepresentation in the political process as another warning sign in determining whether a classification is suspect. See, e.g., Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 686; Foley v. Connelie, 435 U.S. 291, 294 (1978). The plurality in Frontiero, in noting that women face "pervasive discrimination," found that the effects of this discrimination persisted "most conspicuously in the political arena." Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 686.[25]

---

[24] It is precisely those vestiges of the dual system of law for men and women that must be subjected to the strictest scrutiny -- a scrutiny informed by our all too recent recognition of the historical depth and persistence of sex discrimination in this country and the difficulty the judiciary has had in recognizing discrimination in culturally accepted stereotypes. See, e.g., Wendy Williams, The Equality Crisis: Some Reflections on Culture, Courts and Feminism, 7 Women's Rts. L. Rep. 175 (1982).

[25] Indeed, this underrepresentation is hardly surprising given this country's history regarding exclusion of women from the right to vote. See Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Women as Full Members of the Club: An Evolving American Ideal, 6 Hum. Rts. 1, 4 (1976-77).

Although women are not entirely powerless in the political arena, very little has changed since this Court decided Frontiero over 20 years ago. In 1995, women constitute only eight percent of all U.S. Senators and 10.8 percent of all U.S. Representatives.[26] No woman has ever served as President or Vice President of the United States, a Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Defense, or Speaker of the House.

The representation of women in state governments is only minimally more encouraging. In 1995, only 20.7 percent of state legislators are women.[27] Women hold only 25.9 percent of all state elective executive offices,

---

[26] Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Elective Office 1995 (1995) (fact sheet); Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women Candidates and Winners in 1992 (1992) (fact sheet). Notably, women are significantly less well represented in the U.S. Congress than in the parliaments of other countries. See United Nations, The World's Women: 1995 Trends and Statistics 152 (1995) (chart 6.1).

[27] Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Elective Office 1995 (1995) (fact sheet).

and there is only one woman governor in all 50 states.[28] Women constitute only 18 percent of all mayors of cities with a population over 30,000.[29]

As the plurality in Frontiero recognized, Congress itself has acknowledged that "classifications based upon sex are inherently invidious," by enacting measures to ameliorate certain types of gender-based discrimination. Frontiero, 411 U.S. at 687-88. See, e.g., Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681(a) (1994) (generally prohibiting sex discrimination in federally funded education programs); Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (1988) (prohibiting sex discrimination by employers with 15 or more employees). However, these and other measures are incomplete, and they do not suggest that women have achieved full political power.

For example, while Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d (1988), prohibits discrimination in federally funded programs on the basis of race, color, or national origin, and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (§ 504), 29 U.S.C. § 794 (1988), provides similar protection from discrimination based on disability, to this day there is no parallel federal statutory protection from

---

28 Id.

29 Id.

government-sponsored discrimination based on sex.[30] Likewise, women are not statutorily protected against discrimination in places of public accommodation, although federal law prohibits such discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or disability. See 42 U.S.C. § 2000a (1988) and § 12182 (Supp. V 1993). There also is no statutory prohibition of discrimination based on sex in the making and enforcement of contracts, although race discrimination in this context is prohibited. See 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (1988). Other federal laws address violence and "hate crimes" based on race, religion, or national origin, but not based on sex. See 18 U.S.C. § 245(b)(2) (1994) and 28 U.S.C. § 534 Note (Supp. II 1990).

In sum, the warning signal of political underrepresentation continues to militate in favor of strict scrutiny of classifications based on gender.

B. Arguments Against the Application of Strict Scrutiny to Gender-Based Discrimination Are Unconvincing

In Frontiero, the only articulated argument against applying strict scrutiny to gender-based classifications was that the Equal Rights Amendment, if adopted, "will resolve the substance of this precise question." Frontiero, 411 U.S.

---

30 Although Title IX was modeled after Title VI in form, it is limited to education programs or activities.

at 692 (Powell, J., concurring). The Equal Rights Amendment, although approved by Congress and 35 states, narrowly failed to achieve the requisite state ratification over 13 years ago. It no longer provides a reason for the Court to stay its hand.

In his dissent in J.E.B., Chief Justice Rehnquist suggested that discrimination based on gender did not merit equivalent treatment to racial discrimination because "[r]acial groups comprise numerical minorities in our society, warranting in some situations a greater need for protection, whereas the population is divided almost equally between men and women." 114 S. Ct. at 1435. But, as noted, the number of women in the population has not prevented predominantly male legislatures from enacting state-sponsored discrimination, nor deterred a predominantly male judiciary from upholding gender-based distinctions that disadvantage women, nor extinguished the stereotypes that block advancement in a society still dominated by men. In any event, the Court in Adarand and Croson made clear that strict scrutiny applies equally to racial classifications affecting whites, a substantial majority in this country. See Adarand, 115 S. Ct. at 2110. Thus, minority status is not a talisman for invocation of strict scrutiny.

The Chief Justice also observed in J.E.B. that, "while substantial discrimination against both groups still lingers in our society, racial equality has proved a more challenging goal to achieve on many fronts than gender equality."

114 S. Ct. at 1435.[31] But absolute parity between racial and sexual discrimination is not a prerequisite for this Court to find that classifications based on gender warrant strict scrutiny.[32] Rather, what this Court should focus on is that, as the Chief Justice observed, "substantial discrimination . . . still lingers," id., and that women continue to be excluded from public educational institutions based on their gender rather than their individual ability, as exemplified by the decisions below. These factors counsel strict scrutiny of classifications based on gender.[33]

---

[31] Although certainly there are differences between the histories of race and sex discrimination in this country, the important truth remains that women continue to suffer the effects of historic and persistent sex discrimination. See J.E.B., 114 S. Ct. at 1422-1425. Moreover, attempts to establish "a pecking order of oppression" are both divisive and unproductive. See Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Blacklash?, The New Yorker, May 17, 1993, at 42, 43.

[32] This Court has applied strict scrutiny to other suspect classes without a finding of absolute parity with race. See e.g., Graham v. Richardson, 403 U.S. 365, 371-72 (1971) (applying strict scrutiny to classification based on alienage). Moreover, attempts to prioritize the historic significance and impact of race and sex discrimination ignore the interrelation between both types of discrimination and their combined effect in American society. See Kimberle Crenshaw, Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics, 1989 U. Chi. Legal F. 139 (exploring the intersection of race and gender discrimination); Patricia J. Williams, The Alchemy of Race and Rights (1991) (same).

[33] Nor does the presence of actual physical differences between men and women justify a more lenient standard of review for sex discrimination than race discrimination. To the extent that sex-based

There is likewise no valid argument that strict scrutiny is so rigid as to prohibit all sex-based classifications in affirmative remedial programs. Strict scrutiny, as applied to classifications designed to remedy past discrimination, is not inevitably fatal to the classification. Justice O'Connor specifically addressed this very issue in Adarand. See 115 S. Ct. 2097, 2117 (1995). See also id. at 2134 (Ginsburg, J., dissenting) (note that affirmative action programs can satisfy strict scrutiny).[34] The application of strict scrutiny in the sex discrimination context will not preclude the government's ability to adopt genuine affirmative action programs for women.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Court should reverse the decision below and hold that discrimination based on gender is inherently suspect and warrants the highest level of judicial scrutiny.

---

classifications are required by physical characteristics unique to one sex, a strict scrutiny analysis can accommodate those differences. See Jennifer Friesen, State Constitutional Law: Litigating Individual Rights Claims and Defenses ¶ 3.02(c)(i) (1994) (discussing state equal rights amendments).

[34] Thus, for example, single-sex educational programs could withstand strict scrutiny if they were narrowly tailored to serve a genuinely remedial purpose. Cf. Hogan, 458 U.S. at 729-30.

Respectfully submitted,

MARCIA D. GREENBERGER
DEBORAH L. BRAKE
JUDITH C. APPELBAUM
NATIONAL WOMEN'S
LAW CENTER
11 Dupont Circle, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

SARA L. MANDELBAUM
JANET GALLAGHER
MARY WYCKOFF
STEVEN R. SHAPIRO
AMERICAN CIVIL
LIBERTIES UNION
132 W. 43rd Street
New York, N.Y. 10036

ROBERT N. WEINER
Counsel of Record
NANCY L. PERKINS
PETER G. NEIMAN
L. ELIZABETH BOWLES
ROBERTO J.
SANCHEZ-RAMOS
ARNOLD & PORTER
555 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 942-5000
Counsel for Amici Curiae

Of Counsel:
Susan Deller Ross
Wendy W. Williams
Deborah Epstein
Sex Discrimination Clinic
Georgetown University
Law Center
Washington, D.C.

November 16, 1995

APPENDIX

National Women's Law Center

The National Women's Law Center ("NWLC") is a nonprofit legal advocacy organization dedicated to the advancement and protection of women's rights and the corresponding elimination of sex discrimination from all facets of American life. Since 1972. the Center has worked to secure equal opportunity in education for girls and women through full enforcement of the Constitution and laws prohibiting discrimination. It has a deep and abiding interest in assuring the eradication of state sponsored discrimination against women and girls in education.

American Civil Liberties Union

The American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU") is a nationwide, nonpartisan organization of nearly 300,000 members which is dedicated to preserving the Bill of Rights. The ACLU Women's Rights Project, established in 1971, has been a leader in persuading courts to extend the protections of the Constitution to bring down the barriers to full equality for women in American society. The ACLU Women's Rights Project served as co-counsel to Shannon Richey Faulkner in her challenge to the all-male state military school, The Citadel of South Carolina. The ACLU has a direct and profound interest in the outcome of the VMI litigation, and adds an invaluable perspective to this appeal as *amicus curiae*. The need for this Court's guidance on the proper application of intermediate scrutiny is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than by the turn of events in the Citadel litigation, in which, under the Fourth Circuit's order, the case has been remanded to the trial court to litigate the constitutionality of segregated educational programs under the cloud of the two unconstitutional standards concocted by

the Fourth Circuit -- both the "special" intermediate scrutiny and the "substantively comparable" tests.

American Association of University Women

The American Association of University Women's ("AAUW") 150,000 members work for education and equity for women and girls. Since 1881, AAUW has advocated for equal education opportunities for students at every level. AAUW joins this brief because of its interest in ensuring that women have equal access to prestigious state institutions of higher education.

The American Jewish Committee

The American Jewish Committee ("AJC") is a national civic organization of approximately 50,000 members which was founded in 1906 for the purpose of protecting the civil and religious rights of Jews. AJC has always believed that this goal can best be accomplished by helping to preserve and promote the constitutional rights of all Americans. Specifically, AJC strongly supports full and equal rights for women and is committed to the elimination of all gender-based discrimination, regardless of the form in which it may appear. We believe that the alternative educational plan presented by the state of Virginia was based upon outdated gender stereotypes and fails to provide an equivalent educational training experience for women, thus depriving women of equal protection under the law.

Anti-Defamation League

The Anti-Defamation League ("ADL") is one of the nation's oldest civil rights and human relations organizations, founded in 1913 to combat anti-Semitism and to promote

good will among all races, ethnic groups, and religious groups. ADL's ultimate purpose is to secure justice and fair treatment to all citizens alike and to put an end forever to unjust and unfair discrimination against and ridicule of any sect or body of citizens. For eight decades the ADL has actively combated discrimination in employment, housing, education, and public accommodations.

Business and Professional Women/USA

Business and Professional Women/USA ("BPW/USA"), founded in 1919, promotes equity for all women in the workplace through advocacy, education and information. With 80,000 members in 2,800 local organizations throughout all 435 Congressional districts, BPW/USA is comprised of women and men of every age, race, religion, political party and socio-economic background. BPW/USA supports this amicus brief because we understand that full access to the widest possible range of educational opportunities is crucial if women are to achieve full economic equity in the workplace and society.

Center for Women Policy Studies

The Center for Women Policy Studies was founded in 1972 as the first national policy research and advocacy institute focused exclusively on issues of social and economic justice for women. The Center conducts research and advocacy programs on sexual harassment and violence against women, work/family and "diversity" policies of employers, education, and other relevant issues.

Coalition of Labor Union Women

The Coalition of Labor Union Women ("CLUW"), founded in 1974, is a national association of over 20,000 union members which advances the benefits of organized workplaces for women and promotes women's leadership development within the labor movement. CLUW is also an advocacy organization on behalf of millions of American working women, promoting affirmative action, leadership, health care reform, pay equity, child care options, and reproductive health. The Coalition of Labor Union Women opposes discrimination against women in all forms.

Connecticut Women's Education and Legal Fund

The Connecticut Women's Education and Legal Fund ("CWELF") works through legal and public policy strategies and community education to end sex discrimination and empower all women to be full and equal participants in society. CWELF was founded in 1973 and has over 1,000 members. CWELF seeks to join this case as amicus curiae because it is integral to our mission to ensure equal educational and occupational opportunities for women.

Feminist Majority Foundation

The Feminist Majority Foundation ("Foundation") is a non-profit organization with offices in Arlington, Virginia and Los Angeles, California. The Foundation focuses on using research and education to eliminate sex discrimination and promote equality, women's rights, and a feminist agenda including gender equity in education.

Federally Employed Women, Inc.

("FEW") is an international nonprofit organization representing over one million civilian and military women employed by the Federal government. Since its inception in 1968, FEW's primary objective has been to eliminate sex discrimination and sexual harassment and enhance career opportunities for women in government. The Virginia Military Institute case is particularly of interest to FEW in that it denies young women the opportunity to receive quality military training and further perpetuates the notion that the military services can willfully and legally maintain policies and practices that are clearly discriminatory on the basis of gender.

Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund

The Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) is a national nonprofit civil rights organization established in 1967. Its principal objective is to secure the civil rights of Latinos in the United States through litigation and education. It frequently represents plaintiffs in equal protection challenges to education programs and appears as amicus curiae in federal courts, including cases before this Court.

National Association for Girls & Women in Sport

For nearly 100 years the National Association for Girls & Women in Sport ("NAGWS") has been the primary educational organization dedicated to help ensure quality and equality in girl's and women's sports programs. The organization includes over 10,000 teachers, coaches, trainers, athletic directors and administrative and sport officials who are dedicated to gender equality. The Virginia

Military Institute case is one of many that will help to promote equality for girls and women.

National Association of Social Workers

The National Association of Social Workers, Inc. ("NASW"), a nonprofit professional association with over 160,000 members, is the largest organization for social workers in the world. The Virginia Chapter has over 3,300 members. The Association is devoted to promoting the quality and effectiveness of social work practice, to advancing the knowledge base of the social work profession and to improving the quality of life through utilization of social work knowledge and skill. NASW is interested in this case because of its implications for the Constitutional guarantee of equal educational opportunity for women.

National Council of Jewish Women

The National Council of Jewish Women ("NCJW"), Inc. is a volunteer organization, inspired by Jewish values, that works through a program of research, education, advocacy and community services to improve the quality of life for women, children and families and strives to ensure individual rights and freedoms for all. Founded in 1893, the National Council of Jewish Women has 90,000 members in over 500 communities around the country. The National Council of Jewish Women believes that "individual liberties and rights guaranteed by the Constitution are keystones of a free and pluralistic society and must be protected." Based on NCJW's *National Resolutions* stating our belief that equality of rights shall not be denied or abridged on the basis of gender, we join this brief.

National Council of Negro Women

The National Council of Negro Women ("NCNW") is the nation's most broadly based organization of African American women. A nonprofit voluntary service organization and 250 community based sections, NCNW conducts outreach to over four million women. Pursuant to NCNW's goal of providing greater opportunities for African American women, NCNW opposes sex discrimination in publicly funded universities such as the Virginia Military Institute.

National Education Association

The National Education Association ("NEA") is a nationwide employee organization with a current membership of 2.2 million members, the vast majority of whom are employed by public education institutions. Because NEA has long opposed gender discrimination in educational institutions, it joins this brief as amicus curiae.

National Organization for Women

The National Organization for Women ("NOW") is the largest feminist organization in the United States with a membership of over 250,000 women and men and more than 750 chapters throughout the country. Since its founding in 1966, a major goal of NOW has been the eradication of sex discrimination in all aspects of education. NOW believes that until girls and women have equal access to all publicly funded educational institutions, and all of the programs therein, they are unlawfully denied the very basis of equal opportunity to compete and achieve in every aspect and level of U.S. society. In furthering its commitment to that goal, NOW has participated in numerous legal cases and worked

for legislation and regulations to secure full enforcement of laws prohibiting sex discrimination in education.

NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund

The NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund ("NOW LDEF") is one of the nation's foremost nonprofit advocacy organizations dedicated to the elimination of sex discrimination. Since its inception in 1970, the NOW LDEF has been involved in many federal and state cases concerning the issues of sexual harassment, education and women's rights. NOW LDEF is especially concerned with the issues raised in this case because of the importance of ensuring that women and girls receive non-discriminatory education under non-discriminatory conditions.

National Women's Conference Committee

Since its inception in 1977, the National Women's Conference Committee ("NWCC") has supported the grassroots movement for women's rights, as well as legal, economic, and social changes to ensure women's equality. The NWCC supports equal educational opportunities for women and girls, and therefore opposes sex discrimination in publicly funded colleges and universities.

National Woman's Party

The National Woman's Party, founded in 1913, is a historic, nonprofit, nonpartisan organization devoted to equality for women. In keeping with our historic commitment to equality for all people, the National Woman's Party strongly supports the inclusion of young women as full and equal participants at the Virginia Military Institute and joins this amicus brief in the VMI case.

Older Women's League

The Older Women's League ("OWL") is the first and only national grassroots membership organization whose sole mission is to address the special concerns and needs of women as they age. OWL has a long history of fighting discrimination and working for equal access in education, employment, and all other areas of daily life.

People For the American Way

People For the American Way ("People For") is a nonpartisan, education-oriented citizens' organization established to promote and protect civil and constitutional rights. Founded in 1980 by a group of religious, civic and educational leaders devoted to our nation's heritage of tolerance, pluralism and liberty, People For now has over 300,000 members nationwide. People For has been actively involved in efforts to combat discrimination and promote equal rights, including supporting the enactment of civil rights legislation, participating in civil rights litigation, and conducting programs and studies directed at reducing problems of bias, injustice and discrimination. As this Court has recognized, government classifications based on gender all too often reflect our nation's "long and unfortunate

history of sex discrimination." People For strongly supports the principle that strict scrutiny should be applied to government classifications based on gender, in order to ensure that a clear-cut and demanding standard of review is applied to such classifications.

Trial Lawyers for Public Justice

Trial Lawyers for Public Justice ("TLPJ") is a national public interest law firm dedicated to using trial lawyers' skills and strategies to advance the public good. Supported by a nationwide network of over 1,500 of the country's outstanding trial attorneys, TLPJ has actively pursued numerous sex discrimination in education cases under the equal protection clause, in addition to federal statutory provisions.

Women Employed

Women Employed is a national organization of working women, based in Chicago, with a membership of 2000. Since 1973, the organization has assisted thousands of working women with problems of sex discrimination. Women Employed works to empower women to improve their economic status and to remove barriers to economic equity through advocacy, direct service and public education. Women Employed strongly believes that one of the most fundamental guarantees that women are entitled to the under equal protection of the law concerns opportunity.

Women's Law Project

The Women's Law Project ("WLP") is a non-profit, feminist legal advocacy organization located in Pennsylvania. Founded in 1974, WLP works to abolish discrimination and

injustice and to advance the legal and economic status of women and their families through litigation, public policy advocacy and education. WLP believes that access to equal educational opportunities is essential to achieving equal rights for women, and has worked throughout its twenty-one year history to eliminate sex discrimination in education.

Women's Legal Defense Fund

Founded in 1971, the Women's Legal Defense Fund ("WLDF") is a national advocacy organization that develops and promotes public policies to help women achieve equal opportunity, quality health care, and economic security for themselves and their families. WLDF has been an active participant in virtually all major sex discrimination cases before the Supreme Court, in countless cases in the lower federal courts, in congressional efforts to remedy sex discrimination, and in nationwide education efforts to inform policymakers and others about sex discrimination.

Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment

Women Work! The National Network for Women's Employment represents more than 1300 local women's employment and training programs throughout the country who are working to promote gender equity and eliminate sex bias and sex stereotyping in training and education. Women Work! is committed to building awareness and promoting programs and policies to meet the needs of women and girls entering, reentering, and/or training for the work force. Women Work! believes that the exclusion of women from the Virginia Military Institute violates women's right to equal protection under the fourteenth amendment, and that

the establishment of a separate program at Mary Baldwin College sets up a less rigorous training program that is based on gender stereotypes about men's and women's learning abilities.